



PTO/SB/21 (07-06)

Approved for use through 09/30/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number	10/825,639
Filing Date	April 15, 2004
First Named Inventor	Koskey
Art Unit	3742
Examiner Name	Robinson
Attorney Docket Number	KHI-0401

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement

<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/
Incomplete Application
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 | <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers

<input type="checkbox"/> Petition
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a
Provisional Application
<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation
Change of Correspondence Address
<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer
<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund
<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD | <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board
of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC
(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify
below):
Return Post card |
|--|--|---|

Remarks
CORRECTED APPEAL BRIEF**SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT**

Firm Name	Law Office of Dale B. Halling		
Signature			
Printed name	Dale B. Halling		
Date	2/28/2007	Reg. No.	38,170

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature			
Typed or printed name	Theresa A. Jones	Date	2/28/2007

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



PATENT

Corrected Appeal Brief
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

APPLICANT(S): Koskey

EXAMINER: Robinson,

SERIAL NO.: 10/825,639

ART GROUP: 3742

FILED: April 15, 2004

Case No.: KHI-0401.

ENTITLED: Heated Pet Bed

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450 on:

2/29/07



(Dale B. Halling)

Date of Deposit

Attorney of Record Signature

APPEAL BRIEF

Honorable Commissioner of
Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an appeal from the second rejection of claims 1-12 in the Office Action dated August 23, 2006. This application was filed on April 15, 2004. Appellant submits this Appeal Brief pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §134 and 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal filed herewith. The fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(b) and any other necessary fees have been paid.

I. Real Party In Interest

The real party in interest is: K&H Manufacturing, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of Colorado, and having a place of business at 975 Ford Street, Colorado Springs, Colorado. See the Assignment recorded at Reel 015230, Frame 0988.

II. Related Appeals And Interferences

There are no appeals or interferences related to the present appeal.

III. Status Of Claims

Claims 1-12 (see Appendix) are pending in this application. Claims 1-12 are rejected and are involved in this appeal.

IV. Status Of Amendments

No amendment was filed subsequent to the rejection of August 23, 2006. There has been no resolution of the substantive rejections.

V. Summary Of Claimed Subject Matter

The claims discussed the “Argument” section are claims 1, 6, 7 and 12.

Claim 1 requires “a fire retardant covering”. This is discussed on page 4, lines 21-22 as “In one embodiment, the covering 22 (FIG. 2) is made of a fire retardant material.” This element is also discussed with respect to FIG. 3 elements 42 & 50 (Page 4, lines 25-26 & 28). Claim 1 requires that the covering 22 have a shape of a truncated circle folded in half. This is shown in FIG. 2 and in FIG. 4. This is discussed on page 4, lines 9-14 as “The heated pet mat 20 has covering 22 that is in the form of a truncated semicircle. The truncated semicircle is a semicircle 24 having a radius 26. The ends 28 and 30 of the semicircle shown in dashed lines have been removed from the semicircle 24. Note that it would be possible to use a semicircle on top of a rectangle, but this would increase the amount of wasted covering material.” Note that a “truncated semicircle” is defined as a semicircle with the ends 28, 30 removed or squared off. The purpose of the “truncated circle” is discussed on page 5, lines 9-15 as “The sheet of plastic 60 is cut to form either two truncated semicircles 62, 64 or as a truncated circle 66. The truncated circle 66 can be folded to form the two layers of the outer cover of the heated pet mat. The shaded parts 68 of the sheet of plastic 60 are the wasted material. This design significantly reduces the amount of wasted material 68 compared to a full circular design or to full semicircles. This allows the heated pet mat to be produced economically.” As stated in the “Background” Section the waste associated with a semicircular or round designs has priced these designs out of the market. (Page 1, lines 21-24)

Claim 1 also requires “a resistive heating element.” This is element 46 of FIG. 3 and is discussed on pages 4 & 5, lines 26-29 & 4.

Claim 6 requires that the truncated circle have a width that is 10% shorter than its radius. This concept is shown in FIGs. 2 & 4 and discussed on page 4, lines 22-23 as "Note that in one embodiment, the width (w) 36 is 10% shorter or less than the radius 26."

Claim 7 requires a housing having the shape of a truncated semicircle. This is shown in FIG. 2 and in FIG. 4. This is discussed on page 4, lines 9-14 as "The heated pet mat 20 has covering 22 that is in the form of a truncated semicircle. The truncated semicircle is a semicircle 24 having a radius 26. The ends 28 and 30 of the semicircle shown in dashed lines have been removed from the semicircle 24. Note that it would be possible to use a semicircle on top of a rectangle, but this would increase the amount of wasted covering material." Note that a "truncated semicircle" is defined as a semicircle with the ends 28, 30 removed or squared off. The purpose of the "truncated circle" is discussed on page 5, lines 9-15 as "The sheet of plastic 60 is cut to form either two truncated semicircles 62, 64 or as a truncated circle 66. The truncated circle 66 can be folded to form the two layers of the outer cover of the heated pet mat. The shaded parts 68 of the sheet of plastic 60 are the wasted material. This design significantly reduces the amount of wasted material 68 compared to a full circular design or to full semicircles. This allows the heated pet mat to be produced economically." As stated in the "Background" Section the waste associated with a semicircular or round designs has priced these designs out of the market. (Page 1, lines 21-24)

Claim 7 also requires "heating element" contained in the housing. This is element 46 of FIG. 3 and is discussed on pages 4 & 5, lines 26-29 & 4.

Claim 12 requires “a first layer of fire retardant plastic.” This is discussed on page 4, lines 21-22 as “In one embodiment, the covering 22 (FIG. 2) is made of a fire retardant material.” This element is also discussed with respect to FIG. 3 elements 42 & 50 (Page 4, lines 25-26 & 28). Claim 12 requires that the first layer be in the shape of a truncated semicircle. This is discussed on page 5, lines 9-15 as “The sheet of plastic 60 is cut to form either two truncated semicircles 62, 64 or as a truncated circle 66.” Claim 12 then requires a first transfer foil. This is element 44 of FIG. 3. The next element of claim 12 is the layer of heating wire. This is element 46 of FIG. 3. The next element is the second transfer foil. This is element 48 of FIG. 3. The next element is the second layer of fire retardant material. This is element 50 of FIG. 3. Claim 12 requires that the fire retardant material be sealed along the edge 52 of the first and second layer. This is discussed on page 5, lines 1-3.

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Whether claims 1-11 are unpatentable over Stanfield (USPN 5,371,340) in view of Feibus (5,685,257) and further in view of Raitanen et al (6,044,794) and Boulet d'Auria (USPN 5,229,281).

2. Whether claim 12 is unpatentable over Stanfield (USPN 5,371,340) in view of Feibus (5,685,257), Boulet d'Auria (USPN 5,229,281) and, Raitanen et al (6,044,794) and further in view of Graflind (4,788,417).

VII. Argument

Issue 1. Whether claims 1-11 are unpatentable over Stanfield (USPN 5,371,340) in view of Feibus (5,685,257) and further in view of Raitanen et al (6,044,794) and Boulet d'Auria (USPN 5,229,281).

The question of obviousness requires that we determine if the references, taken as a whole, would suggest the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. *Medtronic, Inc. v. Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1563, 220 USPQ 97 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Claim 1 requires a fire retardant covering in the shape of a truncated circle folded in half. This shape is shown in FIG.s 2 & 4 of the specification is vitally important in making an economical heated pet mat for igloo shaped doghouses, see FIG. 1. For more information please see the background section, page 1 of the specification. The Examiner suggests Raitanen and Boulet d'Auria both show a truncated circle and Feibus shows folding in half. However, Raitanen does not show a truncated circle. He shows an oval shaped suspended pet bed. Boulet d'Auria shows a pipe or tube. There is no suggestion in any of the prior art references to fold the oval in half. Feibus shows a rectangular pet bed, which might be folded in half but does not suggest this for any other shape. Clearly this combination does not suggest the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art.

What the Examiner has attempted to do is pick out elements from the prior art references without any regard to their teaching. The Examiner has "selected bits and pieces from prior patents that might be modified to fit its" conclusion. This is not the correct standard for non-obviousness. *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Manufacturing Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561, 1 USPQ2d 1593, 1605 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Stanfield has a top sheet 12 of molded plastic bonded to a lower sheet 14 (Col. 2, lines 41-45). Both parts are rectangular and the top sheet is relatively rigid (Col. 1, line 56). Stanfield is a heated mat. Feibus is a non-heated rectangular pet mat. Raitanen is an oval shaped suspended pet bed. Boulet d'Auria is directed to an "electro-welding element" – clearly this reference is not relevant under the law and cannot be combined with the other elements to produce a case of obviousness. None of these references discuss the problem of making a heated pet mat for an "igloo" or round pet house. The only logical combination of the references is a heated, suspended oval or rectangular pet mat. The

combination clearly does not teach or suggest the invention of the present application. Claim 1 is clearly allowable.

Claims 2-5 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 6 further defines the shape of the mat. The question of obviousness requires that we determine if the references, taken as a whole, would suggest the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. *Medtronic, Inc. v. Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1563, 220 USPQ 97 (Fed. Cir. 1983). This is not shown or suggested in the prior art references.

Claim 7 requires a housing having a shape of a truncated semicircle. This shape is shown in FIG.s 2 & 4 of the specification is vitally important in making an economical heated pet mat for igloo shaped doghouses, see FIG. 1. For more information please see the background section, page 1 of the specification. The Examiner suggests Raitanen and Boulet d'Auria both show a truncated circle and Feibus shows folding in half. However, Raitanen does not show a truncated circle. He shows an oval shaped suspended pet bed. Boulet d'Auria shows a pipe or tube. There is no suggestion in any of the prior art references to fold the oval in half. Feibus shows a rectangular pet bed, which might be folded in half but does not suggest this for any other shape. Clearly this combination does not suggest the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art.

What the Examiner has attempted to do is pick out elements from the prior art references without any regard to their teaching. The Examiner has "selected bits and pieces from prior patents that might be modified to fit its" conclusion. This is not the correct standard for non-obviousness. *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Manufacturing Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561, 1 USPQ2d 1593, 1605 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Stanfield has a top sheet 12 of molded plastic bonded to a lower sheet 14 (Col. 2, lines 41-45). Both parts are rectangular and the top sheet is relatively rigid (Col. 1, line 56). Stanfield is a heated mat. Feibus is a non-heated rectangular pet mat. Raitanen is an oval shaped suspended pet bed. Boulet d'Auria is directed to an "electro-welding element" – clearly this reference is not relevant under the law and cannot be combined with the other elements to produce a case of obviousness. None of these references discuss the problem of making a heated pet mat for an "igloo" or round pet house. The only logical

combination of the references is a heated, suspended oval or rectangular pet mat. The combination clearly does not teach or suggest the invention of the present application. Claim 7 is clearly allowable.

Claims 8-11 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

ISSUE 2. Whether claim 12 is unpatentable over Stanfield (USPN 5,371,340) in view of Feibus (5,685,257), Boulet d'Auria (USPN 5,229,281) and, Raitanen et al (6,044,794) and further in view of Graflind (4,788,417).

The question of obviousness requires that we determine if the references, taken as a whole, would suggest the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. *Medtronic, Inc. v. Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1563, 220 USPQ 97 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Claim 12 requires a fire retardant having a shape of a truncated semicircle. This shape is shown in FIG.s 2 & 4 of the specification is vitally important in making an economical heated pet mat for igloo shaped doghouses, see FIG. 1. For more information please see the background section, page 1 of the specification. The Examiner suggests Raitanen and Boulet d'Auria both show a truncated circle and Feibus shows folding in half. However, Raitanen does not show a truncated circle. He shows an oval shaped suspended pet bed. Boulet d'Auria shows a pipe or tube. There is no suggestion in any of the prior art references to fold the oval in half. Feibus shows a rectangular pet bed, which might be folded in half but does not suggest this for any other shape. Graflind according to the Examiner discloses a heating pad with several heating foils. Clearly this combination does not suggest the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art.

What the Examiner has attempted to do is pick out elements from the prior art references without any regard to their teaching. The Examiner has "selected bits and pieces from prior patents that might be modified to fit its" conclusion. This is not the correct standard for non-obviousness. *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Manufacturing Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561, 1 USPQ2d 1593, 1605 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Stanfield has a top sheet 12 of molded plastic bonded to a lower sheet 14 (Col. 2, lines 41-45). Both parts are rectangular and the top sheet is relatively rigid (Col. 1, line 56). Stanfield is a heated mat. Feibus is a non-heated rectangular pet mat. Raitanen is an oval shaped suspended pet bed. Boulet d'Auria is directed to an "electro-welding element" – clearly

this reference is not relevant under the law and cannot be combined with the other elements to produce a case of obviousness. Grafind according to the Examiner discloses a heating pad with several heating foils. None of these references discuss the problem of making a heated pet mat for an "igloo" or round pet house. The only logical combination of the references is a heated, suspended oval or rectangular pet mat. The combination clearly does not teach or suggest the invention of the present application. Claim 12 is clearly allowable.

VIII. Claims Appendix

1. A heated pet mat, comprising:

a fire retardant covering having a shape of a truncated circle folded in half to form two layers; and
a resistive heating element sandwiched between the two layers.
2. The heated pet mat of claim 1, wherein the two layers are sealed along an edge.
3. The heated pet mat of claim 2, wherein the fire retardant covering is made of acrylonitrile butadien styrene plastic.
4. The heated pet mat of claim 2, wherein the fire retardant covering is made of polyvinyl chloride.
5. The heated pet mat of claim 2, wherein the two layers are sealed by welding the two layers together.
6. The heated pat mat of claim 1, wherein the truncated circle has a width that is 10% shorter than a radius.

7. A heated pet mat, comprising:
- a housing having a shape of a truncated semicircle; and
a heating element contained within the housing.
8. The heated pet mat of claim 7 wherein the housing is formed of two layers of fire retardant plastic.
9. The heated pet mat of claim 8, wherein the two layers of plastic are made of acrylonitrile butadiene styrene plastic.
10. The heated pet mat of claim 7, wherein the heating element includes a resistive heat wire.
11. The heated pet mat of claim 10, wherein the heating element includes a transfer foil.
12. A heated pet mat, comprising:
- a first layer of fire retardant plastic in a shape of a truncated semicircle;
a first transfer foil having approximately a same shape as the first layer of fire retardant plastic adjacent to the first layer of fire retardant plastic;
a layer of heating wire adjacent to the first transfer foil;
a second transfer foil having approximately the same shape as the first layer of fire retardant plastic adjacent to the layer of heating wire; and
a second layer of fire retardant plastic having approximately the same shape as the first layer of fire retardant plastic and sealed along an edge to the first layer of fire retardant plastic and second layer of fire retardant plastic.


IX. Evidence Appendix

None

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

None

Respectfully submitted,
(Koskey)

By: 
Attorney for the Applicant
Dale B. Halling
Registration No. 38,170
Customer No.: 25,007
Phone: (719) 447-1990
Fax: (719) 447-9815